UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,895	12/27/2000	Yueheng Xu	INTL-0403-US(P8986)	5241

7590 05/05/2005		EXAMINER
Timothy N. Trop		NGUYEN, CHAU T
TROP PRUNER & HU, P.C.		

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

Timothy N. Trop
TROP PRUNER & HU, P.C.
STE 100
8554 KATY FWY
HOUSTON, TX 77024-1805

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/748,895	XU, YUEHENG
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Chau Nguyen	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _11 April 2005_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-7,11-17,21-24 and 26-32_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-7,11-17,21-24 and 26-32_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/11/2005 has been entered. Claims 1-7, 11-17, 21-24, and 26-32.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1, 3-7, 11, 13-17, 21, 23-24, and 26-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powell, Patent No. 5,157,905, Taieb, Patent No. 6,718,519, and further in view of Rojas et al. (Rojas), Patent No. 6,425,123.

4.   As to claims 1, 11 and 21, Powell discloses a method comprising:

receiving a file including characters (col. 11, line 43 – col. 12, line 14 and Fig. 6:receiving an input digital document and identify the character set and language of the digital document);

converting the characters of said file to a first code format if the characters are of a first type (col. 11, line 43 – col. 12, line 14: if the digital document representation is in a Latin-based byte character set, then generate a three-dimensional characterization (first code format) of the digital document using Table 1; and

converting the characters of said file to a second code format having a multiple double byte length if said characters are of a second type (col. 11, line 43 – col. 12, line 14: if the digital document representation is in a multiple byte character set, then generate a two-dimensional characterization (second code) using the mapping in Table 4).

However, Powell does not explicitly disclose displaying the characters of the file using the first code format or the second code format. In the same field of endeavor, Taieb discloses a multilingual text file is decomposed into segments, the invention looks up the preloaded list of system fonts to select the appropriate font (format) for each segments, and then the entire text is displayed with appropriate font for each segment (Fig. 7 and col. 7, line 47 – col. 8, line 51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Taieb and Powell to include displaying characters of the file using the first code format

or the second code format in order to solve fundamental problem when trying to accommodate multilingual output.

However, Powell and Taieb do not explicitly disclose the first code format having a double-byte length. In the same field of endeavor, Rojas discloses translation of single-byte languages into a double-byte character set (first code format) (Abstract, Fig. 8, col. 2, line 48 – col. 3, line 21 and col. 10, lines 23-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Rojas and Powell and Taieb to include first code format having a double-byte length to create double-wide characters, and the double-wide characters increase the spacing, i.e., field length, typically needed for translation of the text into a different language.

5. As to claims 3 and 13, Powell-Taieb-Rojas disclose checking to determine whether a character set plane is changed (Powell, col. 13, line 38 – col. 15, line 2: detecting the characters/language of the segment of the digital document to be the single language script range).

6. As to claims 4 and 14, Powell-Taieb-Rojas disclose wherein if the character set plane is changed, inserting a new character set designator (Powell, col. 13, line 38 – col. 15, line 2 and col. 15, line 47 – col. 16, line 18: if the characters/language of the segment of the digital is not single language script range, then it must be a multiple

language script range, and assign source code value to a unique target value (character)).

7.   As to claims 5 and 15, Powell-Taieb-Rojas disclose determining whether the characters in the file are defined according to the first code format (Powell, col. 11, line 43 – col. 12, line 55: detecting the characters in the digital document means determines whether the digital document is expressed in a Latin-based single byte character (first code format)).

8.   As to claims 6, 16 and 23, Powell-Taieb-Rojas disclose wherein if said characters are coded according to said first code format, table mapping Unicode values to said first code format (Powell, col. 14, lines 15-38 and Table 5).

9.   As to claims 7, 17 and 24, Powell-Taieb-Rojas disclose wherein if said first code format is not utilized, using the surrogate area of Unicode (Powell, col. 14, line 40 – col. 15, line 2 and Table 5).

10.   As to claims 26, 29, and 32, Powell-Taieb-Rojas disclose converting the characters to the first code format or the second code format before parsing a web page including the characters (Taieb, col. 3, line 29 – col. 4, line 38).

11.   As to claims 27 and 30, Powell-Taieb-Rojas disclose wherein displaying the

characters comprises converting each converted character into an encoding and

indexing into a font file using the encoding to obtain the character (Powell, col. 13, line

59 – col. 15, line 47).

12.   As to claim 28, Powell-Taieb-Rojas wherein the second code format

accommodates at least 100,000 characters (Powell, col. 7, lines 6-37).

13.   As to claim 31, Powell-Taieb-Rojas storing instructions that if executed enable

the processor-based system to use the encoding to access the font file for the

characters of the second type arranged in a row and column format (Taieb, Fig. 3: the

motivation of Taieb's system is to identify the language or character set being used in

the data so that a best match to available output fonts may be made).

14.   Claims 2, 12 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Powell, Taieb, and Rojas as applied to claims 1, 3-7, 11, 13-17, 21, 23-24 and 26-

32 above, and further in view of Lincke et al. (Lincke), Patent No. 6,397,259.

15.   As to claims 2, 12 and 22, Powell-Taieb-Rojas disclose receiving a digital

document (web page) in a plane and row format (Powell, col. 13, lines 4-15: digital

document representation into segments (rows)). However, Powell does not explicitly

disclose a web in a plane, row and column format. Lincke discloses web pages

includes graphic, text, frame, tables (columns and rows), form, etc... (col. 3, lines 6-33 and col. 21, line 65 – col. 22, line 8). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Lincke and Powell-Taieb-Rojas to include a web page in a plane, row and column format in order to provide user friendly environment for web users.

Response to Arguments

16.   Applicant's arguments and amendments filed on 04/11/2005 have been fully considered but they are not deemed fully persuasive. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 11 and 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as explained here below, necessitated by Applicant's substantial amendment (i.e., first code format having a double-byte length and second code format having a multiple double-byte length) to the claims which significantly affected the scope thereof.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4092. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached at (571) 272-4090.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chau Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176

SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER